## PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

# TRANSLATION INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (Chapter II of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

n a a m							
pplicant's or agent's file reference H103-2666-WO	FOR FURTHER A		See Form PCT/IPEA/416				
ternational application No.	International filing da		Priority date (day/month/year)				
PCT/JP2004/0119	90 20.08.200	)4	12.09.2003				
301J23/63, B01D	(IPC) or national classification and 053/94, B01J37/0	PC 8, F01N3/10	)				
oplicant HONDA MOTOR CO.							
This report is the internunder Article 35 and training	national preliminary examination rensmitted to the applicant according	eport, established by the to Article 36.	nis International Preliminary Examining Authority				
2. This REPORT consists		sheets, inclu	ding this cover sheet.				
	npanied by ANNEXES, comprising	g:					
			sheets, as follows:				
a. (sent to the applicant and to the International Bureau) a total of sheets, as follows:  sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets containing rectifications authorized by this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions).  sheets which supersede earlier sheets, but which this Authority considers contain an amendment that goes beyond the Supplemental sheets which supersede earlier sheets, but which this Authority considers contain an amendment that goes beyond							
sheets the display.	which supersede earlier sheets, busclosure in the international applic	eation as filed, as indic	ated in item 4 of Box No. I and the Supplemental				
b. (sent to the	International Bureau only) a total o	of (indicate type and nu	mber of electronic carrier(s))				
<del></del>			, containing a sequence listing and/or tables				
related therete	o, in computer readable form only	, as indicated in the Su	applemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing (see				
Section 802 o	of the Administrative Instructions).						
<ol> <li>This report contains in</li> </ol>	dications relating to the following i	tems:					
Box No. I	Basis of the report						
Box No. II	Priority						
Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion w	ith regard to novelty, i	nventive step and industrial applicability				
Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention						
Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Articicitations and explanations support	St. 35(2) with regard to orting such statement	हरान्द्रीपु, inventive अस्तृ का industrial applicability;				
Box No. VI	Certain documents cited						
Box No. VII	Certain defects in the internation	onal application					
Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the inte						
Date of submission of the dema		Date of completion	of this report				
Date of submission of the dense							
Name and mailing address of th	æ IPEA/JP	Authorized officer					
		Telephone No.					
Facsimile No.		Telephone 140.					

International application No.

PCT/JP2004/011990

Box	No. I		Basis of the report			
1.			to the language, this report is based on the international application der this item.	n in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise		
		-	port is based on translations from the original language into the for is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of:	llowing ,		
		international search (Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b))				
		D pu	publication of the international application (Rule 12.4)			
		in	international preliminary examination (Rule 55.2 and/or 55.3)			
2.	recei	iving Officeport):	to the elements of the international application, this report is bas ffice in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to ernational application as originally filed/furnished scription:	ed on (replacement sheets which have been furnished to the in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to		
		pages		as originally filed/furnished		
		pages*	received b	this Authority on		
		pages*	* received b	y this Authority on		
		the clai	aims:			
		nos.		as originally filed/furnished		
		nos.*		as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19		
		nos.*		y this Authority on		
		nos.*		y this Authority on		
	П	•	awings:			
	<b>!1</b>	sheets	-	as originally filed/furnished		
		sheets*				
		sheets*				
			uence listing and/or any related table(s) – see Supplemental Box R			
				Elating to Sequence Listing.		
3.	لــا		umendments have resulted in the cancellation of:			
			the description, pages			
		the claims, nos.				
			the drawings, sheets/figs			
			the sequence listing (specify):			
			, ,, <u> </u>			
4.		This re	report has been established as if (some of) the amendments anne have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indic	xed to this report and listed below had not been made, since ated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).		
			the description, pages			
			the claims, nos.			
			the drawings, sheets/figs			
			the sequence listing (specify):			
			any table(s) related to sequence listing (specify):			
*	If it	em 4 app	oplies, some or all of those sheets may be marked "superseded."			

International application No.
PCT/JP2004/011990

Box	No. I	V Lack of unity of invention
1.		In response to the invitation to restrict or pay additional fees the applicant has:
		restricted the claims.
		paid additional fees.
		paid additional fees under protest.
		neither restricted the claims nor paid additional fees.
2.	$\boxtimes$	This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose, according to Rule 68.1, not to invite the applicant to restrict or pay additional fees.
3.	This	Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rules 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is:
		complied with.
	$\bowtie$	not complied with for the following reasons:
		The matter common to claims 1 to 9 is an exhaust
		gas clarification catalyst comprising an aluminium
		oxide and, supported thereon, a palladium oxide.
		However, the search has revealed that the
		catalyst is disclosed in the document JP 05-285387 A
		(Hitachi, Ltd. et al.), 2 November 1993, claims 1 and
		2, and thus it is clear that the catalyst lacks
		novelty.
		As a result, the above catalyst falls within the
		scope of the prior art, and therefore, the common
		matter (the above catalyst) is not a special technical
		feature within the meaning of PCT Article 13.2, second
		sentence.
		Therefore, since there is no other common matter
		among the inventions according to claims 1 to 5 and 9
		and the inventions according to claims 6 to 8, which
		is considered to be a special technical feature within
		the meaning of PCT Article 13.2, second sentence,
		(Continued in Supplemental Box)
4.	Con	sequently, this report has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:
	$\boxtimes$	all parts.
		the parts relating to claims Nos.

International application No. PCT/JP2004/011990

Вох	No. V			ticle 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; oporting such statement	
1.	Statement				
	Novelty (	(N)	Claims	3-8	YES
			Claims	1, 2, 9	NO
	Inventive	step (IS)	Claims		YES
			Claims	1-9	NO
	Industria	l applicability (IA)	Claims	1-9	YES
			Claims		NO

Citations and explanations (Rule 70.7)

- Document 1: JP 01-168343 A (Toyota Central R&D Labs., Inc.), 3 July 1989
- Document 2: JP 62-282642 A (Toyota Motor Corporation), 8 December 1987
- Document 3: JP 03-068451 A (Toyota Motor Corporation et al.), 25 March 1991
- Document 4: JP 05-285387 A (Hitachi, Ltd. et al.), 2 November 1993
- Document 5: JP 51-123794 A (E.I. Dupont Nemours and Co.), 28 October 1976

The inventions set forth in claims 1, 2 and 9 lack novelty in the light of documents 1 and 4 cited in the international search report.

Documents 1 and 4 set forth a catalyst for clarifying exhaust gas having palladium supported on  $LaAlO_3$ , and a catalyst device for clarifying motor vehicle exhaust gas using said catalyst. LaAlO3 exhibits trigonal or rhombohedric crystals, as described in the description of this application.

The invention set forth in claims 3 to 8 does not involve an inventive step in the light of documents 1 to

International application No.
PCT/JP2004/011990

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

4 cited in the international search report. Claim 3

When using palladium as the catalyst metal of a catalyst for clarifying exhaust gas, having the supported palladium serve as a perovskite composite oxide in order to prevent deterioration under high-temperature reduction was a known technique at the time of filing of this application (see document 2, for example). That being the case, it would be easy for a person skilled in the art to conceive of supporting palladium as a perovskite complex oxide in order to prevent deterioration of a catalyst in the catalyst for clarifying exhaust gas set forth in documents 1 and 4.

#### Claims 4 to 8

It was known at the time of filing of this application that  $LaAlO_3$  could adopt a perovskite structure. Moreover, it is a known technique in common practice to have a carbonic acid complex serve as a constituent element in producing a perovskite composite oxide (see document 3, for example).

The inventions set forth in claims 1 to 9 do not involve an inventive step in the light of documents 2, 3 and 5 cited in the international search report.

Document 5 sets forth, as a three-way catalyst, a catalyst which is obtained by supporting a perovskite composite oxide containing a catalytic active metal on a perovskite composite oxide support such as LaAO<sub>3</sub>.

Meanwhile, using a perovskite composite oxide containing palladium as the catalytic active component of a three-way catalyst was a known technique at the time of

International application No.
PCT/JP2004/011990

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

filing of this application (see document 2, for example). That being the case, in the three-way catalyst set forth in document 5, it would be easy for a person skilled in the art to conceive of supporting a perovskite composite oxide containing palladium on a LaAlO<sub>3</sub> support. It is a known technique in common practice to have a carbonic acid complex serve as a constituent element in the production of perovskite composite oxides (see document 3, for example).

International application No.
PCT/JP2004/011990

Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:

- a) Patent document 1 set forth in paragraph [0004] of the description of this application pertains to a thermoplastic resin composition. There is understood to be an error in the number of patent document 1.
- b) Paragraph [0039] of the description contains the wording "produce  $Pd/Al_2O_3$  using the same method as in production example 1". However, production example 1 is a method of fabricating and a method of supporting composite oxides, therefore it is unclear to what type of production method producing  $Pd/Al_2O_3$  "using the same method" as in said production example refers to.

International application No.
PCT/JP2004/011990

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

Claims 4 and 6 contain the wording "the step of adding... to group of compounds (OH group)". However, it is unclear whether said "step" refers to a step of manufacturing the support component, or refers to a step of producing a support component, or refers to both steps, therefore claims 4 and 6 are unclear. In making the assessment of inventive step, in the light of paragraph [0009] of the description, said process was deemed to refer to the step of producing the support component.

International application No.
PCT/JP2004/011990

#### Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of:

(Continued from Box IV.3)

no technical relationship within the meaning of PCT Article 13.2 can be found between those different inventions.

Accordingly, it is clear that claims 1 to 9 do not comply with the requirement of unity of invention.